THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.26259 of 2005

Dated: 08-12-2005

Between:

V.Satyanarayana Charyulu and others..

.. PETITIONERS

AND

The Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Endowment Department, Hyderabad and others.

.. RESPONDENTS

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed against the order dated 05-12-2005 passed by the Executive Officer of Lakshminarashima Swami Devasthanam, Yadagiri Gutta, the 3rd respondent herein. Through the said proceedings, the 3rd respondent discontinued the petitioners from service. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the impugned order was passed by placing a wrong interpretation on the order passed by this court in W.P.No.16451 of 2005.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Government Pleader for Endowments and the learned Standing Counsel for R-3.

The petitioners were engaged as Paricharakas on the basis of the proceedings dated 27-04-2005 passed by the then Commissioner. The first respondent issued G.O.Rt.No.1123, dated 06-06-2005, keeping in abeyance, all the orders passed by the then Commissioner. The petitioners filed W.P.No.16451 of 2005. In that writ petition, an interim order was granted directing the respondents therein to continue the petitioners. However, the writ petition came to be disposed of on 03-11-2005 directing that the 1st respondent shall issue notice to the petitioner and proceed with the matter further. The interim order granted by this court on 28-07-2005 was vacated. It is in this context that the 3rd respondent discontinued the petitioners.

The only basis for the petitioners to continue in service after the 1st respondent

issued G.O.Rt.No.1123, dated, 06-06-2005, was the interim order granted by this court in W.P.M.P.No.20900 of 2005, dated 28-07-2005. Once the said order has been vacated, it must naturally result in discontinuance of the petitioners. Therefore, no exception can be taken to the impugned order.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. It is, however, made clear that in case the respondents proposed to fill the vacancies, which, hitherto were occupied to the petitioners, they shall consider the cases of the petitioners also. No order as to costs.

_____

08-12-2005

Prv